



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,736	08/20/2003	Michael Peterson	LSI.77US01 (03-1088)	9152
24319	7590	07/18/2007		
LSI CORPORATION 1621 BARBER LANE MS: D-106 MILPITAS, CA 95035			EXAMINER VAUGHN, GREGORY J	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/645,736

Applicant(s)

PETERSON, MICHAEL

Examiner

Gregory J. Vaughn

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Application Background

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 4/27/2007.
2. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3-7 and 12-17. Claim 2 was previously canceled.
3. Claims 1 and 3-21 are pending in the case, claims 1, 7, 13 and 17 are independent claims.
4. Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-14 and 16-21, made under 35 USC 102 in the *Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102* section of the previous office action (dated 3/2/2007) is withdrawn in view of the amended claims. However new grounds of rejection are described below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

"The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention."
6. Claims 1, and 3-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as

to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

7. **Regarding claim 1**, the amendment filed 4/27/2007 adds the following limitations: "*request for an HTML web page*" (first limitation), "*locations of HTML source files*" (first limitation), "*HTML template files*" (first and second limitation), "*HTML content files*" (first, second and third limitation) and "*HTML format files*" (second and third limitation). The examiner has reviewed the originally filed specification, and has failed to find support for the added limitations. Applicant has indicated that support for the amendments can be found in the originally filed specification at page 2 lines 9-10 and in the abstract. The examiner has reviewed the indicated sections, but found the support insufficient. The cited passages indicate that the result is an "*HTML file*" or an "*HTML page*". The description of the invention does not indicate that the components used to achieve the result must be HTML specific components. Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in response to this office action.

8. **Regarding claims 3-21**, the claims contain the same new matter deficiencies as described above with respect to claim 1 and are rejected using the same rationale.

9. Claim 1 and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as

Art Unit: 2178

to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

10. **Regarding claim 1**, the amendment filed 4/27/2007 adds the limitation:

"receiving a request for an HTML web page from a client" (first limitation). The examiner has reviewed the originally filed specification, and has failed to find support for the added limitations. Applicant has indicated that support for the amendments can be found in the originally filed specification at page 2 lines 9-10 and in the abstract. The examiner has reviewed the indicated sections, but found the support insufficient. Requesting a web page that is an HTML web page (and not any other kind of web page) is not enabled by the originally filed specification. Applicant is required to cancel the non-enabled matter in response to this office action.

11. **Regarding claims 3-6**, the claims contain the same enablement deficiencies as described above with respect to claim 1 and are rejected using the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

"(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made."

13. Claims 1, 3, 5-14 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tittel et al., "XML for Dummies", Copyright 2000 IDG Books Worldwide (hereinafter Tittel).

14. **Regarding independent claim 1**, the Tittel reference is a training manual for writing extensible markup-language (XML) documents for use in computers and on the Internet. XML documents can generally be referred to as web pages (page 1, second paragraph). It is well known that XML (and other markup languages) can be used to exchange data on the Internet. Data is exchanged based upon a request from a client; the request is processed by a server, and a resultant web page is transmitted back to the requestor (pages 12-14). Tittel discloses parsing a definition file with a parser, said definition file comprising addresses to template files and addresses to content files, extracting the template and content files where the template file contains formatting information for the web page. Tittel discloses the use of document type definition (DTD) files on pages 61-63. Tittel discloses the use of style

sheets that control formatting of the web page on pages 141-145. Tittel discloses the DTD file referencing the addresses of both template and content files on page 189. Tittel discloses the DTD file referencing multiple template files, where the first template file is selected on pages 145-149. Tittel refers to these types of template files as cascading style sheets (CSS).

Tittel describes web pages that are created using XML components, as described above. Tittel does not disclose creating a resultant HTML web page, per say, however Tittel does indicate that XML and HTML are very closely related computer languages – see page 15 where Tittel recites: “If you know HTML, you know XML” (top of the page) and provides two examples of markup language code that satisfy the requirements of both HTML and XML. Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Tittel to create an HTML page because “XML documents use a syntax that has all the same bits and pieces that you know from traditional HTML pages” (page 15, second paragraph).

15. **Regarding dependent claim 3**, Tittel discloses the template file comprising page layout information on page 145. Tittel recites: “*With CSS1, you can control the format and display of colors and backgrounds, fonts and text, spacing, element positioning and size*”
16. **Regarding dependent claim 5**, Tittel disclose the use of variables on pages 340-341.

17. **Regarding dependent claim 6**, Tittel discloses the use of pointers on pages 241-245
18. **Regarding independent claims 7, 13 and 17**, the claims are directed toward a method or system of claim 1 and are rejected using the same rationale.
19. **Regarding dependent claims 8, 9, 16, 18 and 19**, the claims are directed toward a method and system for the method of claim 5, and are rejected using the same rationale.
20. **Regarding dependent claims 10 and 20**, Tittel discloses a variable that specifies a language preference (described as character sets) on pages 132-135.
21. **Regarding dependent claims 11 and 21**, Tittel discloses a variable that specifies a descriptor of the client computer system (described as a namespace) on pages 210-211.
22. **Regarding dependent claim 12**, the claim is directed toward a system for the method of claim 6 and is rejected using the same rationale.
23. **Regarding dependent claim 14**, Tittel discloses layout information as described above in the rejection of claim 1.

Art Unit: 2178

24. Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tittel in view of Hsu et al. US Patent Publication 2004/0010710, filed 7/10/2002, published 1/15/2004 (hereinafter Hsu).

25. **Regarding dependent claims 4 and 15**, Tittel discloses serving web pages, as described above. Tittel discloses exchanging information, but fails to disclose determining if a client is authorized to view the content. Hsu teaches determining if a user is authorized to view content in figure 3 at reference sign 301 (shown as "Whether the URL is denied").

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill, at the time the invention was made to use the authorization control taught by Hsu with the web page serving system of Tittel in order to provide "*a security system and method, used to control and filter requests according to an individuals user's authority*" (Hsu, paragraph 10).

Response to Arguments

26. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 4/27/2007 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, as described above.
27. Applicant's arguments are substantially directed to the HTML aspects added by the amendment filed 4/27/2007. As noted above, the originally filed specification does not support the position that the invention relies on HTML components to produce an HTML result.

Conclusion

28. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action.

Art Unit: 2178

In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory J. Vaughn whose telephone number is (571) 272-4131. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached at (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

/Gregory J. Vaughn/
Patent Examiner
July 6, 2007